



UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT  
**NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD**  
FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT BRANCH  
Washington, D.C. 20570

Via email

October 8, 2021

Re: FOIA Request NLRB-2021-001334

Dear Michael K. Taylor (Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP):

This is in response to your request, under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), 5 U.S.C. § 552, received on September 9, 2021, in which you seek “a copy of any representation (“RC”) petitions filed in the past 30-days (August 9, 2021 - September 9, 2021) by Workers United or Workers United Upstate, including but not limited to copies of the petitions, statements of position, and any other case documents.” You assumed financial responsibility for the processing of your request in the amount of \$100.00.

We acknowledged your request on September 9, 2021. We are interpreting your request as seeking all records in these five case files. On October 6, 2021, a member of my staff attempted to contact you by email to inquire whether you wanted to include the five available transcript volumes with your request, and if so, an increase in the assumption of fees was necessary. Since there has been no response as of the date of this letter, the transcripts are not included with the records produced for this request. If you are still interested in receiving the transcript records, a new FOIA request should be filed and appropriate fees assumed.

Your request is granted in part and denied in part, as explained below.

A search of the Agency’s electronic casehandling system, NxGen, has been conducted. This search located the following responsive cases, all for the same employer: *Starbucks Corporation*, Case Nos. 03-RC-282115, 03-RC-282127, 03-RC-282139, 03-RC-282640, and 03-RC-282641.

Regarding Case Nos. 03-RC-282115, 03-RC-282127, and 03-RC-282139, a review of the records has determined that certain records responsive to your request are part of an investigative file in an open case before the Agency, and therefore, are exempt from disclosure pursuant to Exemption 7(A) of the FOIA, 5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(7)(A). Exemption 7(A) allows an agency to withhold records included in an open investigatory file where disclosure could reasonably be expected to interfere with enforcement proceedings. *See NLRB v. Robbins Tire &*

*Rubber Co.*, 437 U.S. 214, 236 (1978). Here, the requested cases are pending a pre-election hearing decision in the Agency's Region 3 Buffalo Office, and the release of any investigatory records in the case file at this time could harm or interfere with the ongoing proceeding. Therefore, any investigatory records in the requested case file are being withheld in full pursuant to Exemption 7(A).

Your request for these three cases is granted to the extent that I have attached the formal records, excluding the transcripts as noted above, totaling 266 pages, which are available to the public pursuant to NLRB FOIA regulations. Upon my review, redactions have been made to portions of these records to protect the privacy interests of individuals named in the records. These redactions were made pursuant to FOIA Exemption 6, which pertains to information the release of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy, and FOIA Exemption 7(C), which pertains to records or information compiled for law enforcement purposes, the release of which could reasonably be expected to constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy. 5 U.S.C. § 552(b)(6) and (b)(7)(C).

Please note that Exemption 7(A) protection is "temporal in nature." *Citizens for Responsibility & Ethics in Wash. v. Dep't of Justice*, 746 F.3d 1082, 1097 (D.C. Cir 2014) (citing *NLRB v. Robbins Tire*, 437 U.S. 214, 223-24 230-32 (1978)). As such, case file records may become disclosable, subject to applicable exemptions, after the case closes, that is, that is, once a Board decision issues, the case has been certified, or the case has otherwise been closed under Agency procedures. Accordingly, you may wish to file a new request at that time.

The status of these cases can be tracked on the Agency website at [www.nlr.gov](http://www.nlr.gov) by going to the Cases & Decisions tab, clicking case search, entering the case number in the search box and viewing the case page or by clicking the links here: <https://www.nlr.gov/case/03-RC-282115>, <https://www.nlr.gov/case/03-RC-282127>, and <https://www.nlr.gov/case/03-RC-282139>.

Regarding Case Nos. 03-RC-282640 and 03-RC-282641, a search of NxGen has yielded 47 pages of releasable records from Case No. 03-RC-282640 and 50 pages of releasable records from Case No. 03-RC-282641, which are attached.

After a review, I have determined that portions of the records in Case Nos. 03-RC-282640 and 03-RC-282641 are exempt from disclosure under Exemptions 6 and 7(C) of the FOIA (5 U.S.C. § 552(b)(6) and (b)(7)(C)). Specifically, redactions were made pursuant to FOIA Exemption 6, which pertains to information the release of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy, and FOIA Exemption 7(C), which pertains to records or information compiled for law enforcement purposes, the release of which could reasonably be expected to constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy. 5 U.S.C. § 552(b)(6), (b)(7)(C).

Your request is denied to the extent that six pages in Case No. 03-RC-282640 and six pages in Case No. 03-RC-282641 are being withheld in their entirety pursuant to FOIA Exemption 5 (5 U.S.C. § 552(b)(5)). These records include internal communications, final investigative reports, and draft documents. Exemption 5 allows agencies to withhold “inter-agency or intra-agency memorandums or letters which would not be available by law to a party other than an agency in litigation with the agency,” and covers records that would “normally be privileged in the civil discovery context.” *NLRB v. Sears, Roebuck & Co.*, 421 U.S. 132, 149 (1975); *Tax Analysts v. IRS*, 117 F.3d 607, 616 (D.C. Cir. 1997). The deliberative process and the attorney work-product privileges are two of the primary privileges incorporated into Exemption 5.

The deliberative process privilege protects the internal decision-making processes of government agencies to safeguard the quality of agency decisions. *Competitive Enter. Inst. v. OSTP*, 161 F. Supp.3d 120, 128 (D.D.C. 2016). The basis for this privilege is to protect and encourage the creative debate and candid discussion of alternatives. *Jordan v. U.S. Dep’t. of Justice*, 591 F.2d 753, 772 (D.C. Cir.1978). Two fundamental requirements must be satisfied before an agency may properly withhold a record pursuant to the deliberative process privilege. First, the record must be predecisional, *i.e.*, prepared in order to assist an agency decision-maker in arriving at the decision. *Renegotiation Bd. v. Grumman Aircraft Eng’g Corp.*, 421 U.S. 168, 184 (1975); *Judicial Watch, Inc. v. FDA*, 449 F.3d 141, 151 (D.C. Cir. 2006). Second, the record must be deliberative, *i.e.*, “it must form a part of the agency’s deliberative process in that it makes recommendations or expresses opinions on legal or policy matters.” *Judicial Watch, Inc. v. FDA*, 449 F.3d at 151 (quoting *Coastal States Gas Corp. v. U.S. Dep’t of Energy*, 617 F.2d 854, 866 (D.C. Cir. 1980)). To satisfy these requirements, the agency need not “identify a specific decision in connection with which a memorandum is prepared. Agencies are . . . engaged in a continuing process of examining their policies; this process will generate memoranda containing recommendations which do not ripen into agency decisions; and the lower courts should be wary of interfering with this process.” *Sears, Roebuck & Co.*, 421 U.S. at 151 n.18 (1975). Moreover, the protected status of a predecisional record is not altered by the subsequent issuance of a decision, *see, e.g., Fed. Open Mkt. Comm. v. Merrill*, 443 U.S. 340, 360 (1979); *Elec. Privacy Info. Ctr. v. DHS*, 384 F. Supp. 2d 100, 112-13 (D.D.C. 2005) or by the agency opting not to make a decision. *See Judicial Watch, Inc. v. Clinton*, 880 F. Supp. 1, 13 (D.D.C. 1995), *aff’d*, 76 F.3d 1232 (D.C. Cir. 1996) (citing *Russell v. U.S. Dep’t of the Air Force*, 682 F.2d 1045 (D.C. Cir. 1982)).

The attorney work-product privilege protects records and other memoranda that reveal an attorney’s mental impressions and legal theories that were prepared by an attorney, or a non-attorney supervised by an attorney, in contemplation of litigation. *See United States v. Nobles*, 422 U.S. 225, 239 n.13 (1975); *Hickman*

*v. Taylor*, 329 U.S. 495, 509-10 (1947). Additionally, the protection provided by Exemption 5 for attorney work-product records is not subject to defeat even if a requester could show a substantial need for the information and undue hardship in obtaining it from another source. See *FTC v. Grolier, Inc.*, 462 U.S. 19, 28 (1983). Further, protection against the disclosure of work product records extends even after litigation is terminated. *Id.* The attorney work-product privilege extends to records prepared in anticipation of both pending litigation and foreseeable litigation and even when no specific claim is contemplated at the time the attorney prepared the material. *Schiller v. NLRB*, 964 F.2d 1205, 1208 (D.C. Cir. 1992). Furthermore, the privilege protects any part of a record prepared in anticipation of litigation, not just the portions concerning opinions and legal theories, see *Judicial Watch v. U.S. Dep't of Justice*, 432 F.3d 366, 371 (D.C. Cir. 2005), and is intended to protect an attorney's opinions, thoughts, impressions, interpretations, analyses and strategies. *Id.*; see also *Wolfson v. United States*, 672 F. Supp.2d 20, 29 (D.D.C. 2009). See *Judicial Watch*, 432 F.3d at 371 (finding that an agency need not segregate and disclose non-exempt material if a record is fully protected as work product).

Here, the responsive records being withheld meet the requirements for Exemption 5 protection under both the deliberative process and attorney work-product privileges. They are internal and predecisional. They reflect the views of the General Counsel and her Regional staff concerning prosecutorial policies and strategies in the processing of this unfair labor practice case. Since they analyze various legal theories and strategies, these internal casehandling records clearly reflect the deliberative and consultative process of the Agency that Exemption 5 protects from forced disclosure. *Sears, Roebuck and Co.*, 421 U.S. at 150-52. Additionally, the content of the records is also attorney work-product, as it reflects legal analysis and opinions of the General Counsel's staff created to assist superiors in their decision-making process, in anticipation of possible litigation. Accordingly, the records are being withheld in their entirety.

For the purpose of assessing fees, we have placed you in Category A, commercial use requester. This category refers to requests "from or on behalf of a person who seeks information for a use or purpose that furthers the commercial, trade, or profit interests of the requester or the person on whose behalf the request is made, which can include furthering those interests through litigation." NLRB Rules and Regulations, 29 C.F.R. § 102.117(d)(1)(v). Consistent with this fee category, you "will be assessed charges to recover the full direct costs of searching for, reviewing for release, and duplicating the records sought." 29 C.F.R. § 102.117(d)(2)(ii)(A). Charges are \$9.25 per quarter-hour of professional time. 29 C.F.R. § 102.117(d)(2)(i).

Two and a half hours of professional time were expended in searching for and reviewing for release the requested material. Accordingly, please remit \$92.50.

Payment Instructions: Due to the COVID-19 pandemic and resulting widespread employee telework at the Agency's Headquarters offices, we are no longer accepting checks or money orders as payment at this time. To submit payment for your FOIA request, please use [www.pay.gov](http://www.pay.gov). From the [www.pay.gov](http://www.pay.gov) home page, scroll down to the bottom left corner to select "Pay a FOIA Request." Click "See all options" and go to "Filter By Agency" to check the box for the National Labor Relations Board. Continue following instructions on the website. Please remember to include the Invoice Number, which is the NLRB FOIA Case No., and the amount you intend to pay. Further, please be advised that all FOIA payments must be paid in full before any future FOIA requests are processed.

You may contact Jodilyn Breirather, the FOIA Specialist who processed your request, at (202) 368-1927 or by email at [Jodilyn.Breirather@nrlb.gov](mailto:Jodilyn.Breirather@nrlb.gov), as well as the Agency's FOIA Public Liaison, for any further assistance and/or to discuss any aspect of your request. The FOIA Public Liaison, in addition to the FOIA Specialist, can further explain responsive and releasable agency records, suggest agency offices that may have responsive records, and/or discuss how to narrow the scope of a request in order to minimize fees and processing times. The contact information for the Agency's FOIA Public Liaison is:

FOIA Public Liaison  
National Labor Relations Board  
1015 Half Street, S.E., 4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20570  
Email: [FOIAPublicLiaison@nrlb.gov](mailto:FOIAPublicLiaison@nrlb.gov)  
Telephone: (202) 273-0902  
Fax: (202) 273-FOIA (3642)

After first contacting the Agency, you may additionally contact the Office of Government Information Services (OGIS) at the National Archives and Records Administration to inquire about the FOIA dispute resolution services it offers. The contact information for OGIS is:

Office of Government Information Services  
National Archives and Records Administration  
8601 Adelphi Road-OGIS  
College Park, Maryland 20740-6001  
Email: [ogis@nara.gov](mailto:ogis@nara.gov)  
Telephone: (202) 741-5770  
Toll free: (877) 684-6448  
Fax: (202) 741-5769

You may obtain a review of this determination under the NLRB Rules and Regulations, 29 C.F.R. § 102.117(c)(2)(v), by filing an administrative appeal with

October 8, 2021

Page 6

the Division of Legal Counsel (DLC) through FOIAonline at:  
<https://foiaonline.gov/foiaonline/action/public/home> or by mail or email at:

Nancy E. Kessler Platt  
Chief FOIA Officer  
National Labor Relations Board  
1015 Half Street, S.E., 4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20570  
Email: DLCFOIAAppeal@nlrb.gov

Any appeal must be postmarked or electronically submitted within 90 days of the date of this letter, such period beginning to run on the calendar day after the date of this letter. Any appeal should contain a complete statement of the reasons upon which it is based.

Please be advised that contacting any Agency official (including the FOIA Specialist, FOIA Officer, or the FOIA Public Liaison) and/or OGIS does not stop the 90-day appeal clock and is not an alternative or substitute for filing an administrative appeal.

Sincerely,

*/s/ Synta E. Keeling*

Synta E. Keeling  
FOIA Officer

Attachment: (363 pages)